

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/20382> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Sommer, Dorothe

Title: Unity is strength : Masonic lodges in Ottoman Syria with special focus on Tripoli and El Mina (1860-1908)

Issue Date: 2013-01-08

CHAPTER III: Masonic Grand Bodies

European Grand Lodges

European lodges developed in different social, political and economic surroundings. Consequently, they varied regarding the structural constraints of the prevailing culture, as well as in regard to traditions and the state system. Hence, something that was valid for French lodges may not have been applicable for those in England. As the individual grand lodges started to consider expansion into the Middle East, they carried with them their cultural imprint and their distinctive political and social features. The first lodges in Greater Syria in the second half of the nineteenth century were formed by masons belonging to the Grand Lodge of Scotland. Others from the Grand Orient of France followed. It should be stated that although there had been some lodges under the patronage of the Grand Orient of Italy in Greater Syria as well, they were all short-lived. This was mainly due to the war in Libya in 1911, which badly affected the reputation of Italy and Italian freemasonry.¹ On the other hand, Italian lodges did thrive in Egypt and Turkey, where they were more often than

¹ For further information on Italy and Italian freemasonry, see Derek Beales, *Garibaldi in England: the Politics of Italian Enthusiasm*, in: *Society and Politics in the Age of the Risorgimento*, edited by John A. Davis, Paul Ginsborg, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge/New York: 1991); Marco Novarino, *Grande Oriente d'Italia*, (Erasmus Edizione, Rome: 2006); Paul Naudon, *Histoire Generale de la Franc-Maçonnerie*, (Office du Livre, S.A., Fribourg/Suisse: 1981); R.J.B. Bosworth, *Italy and the Wider World*, (Routledge, London/New York: 1996); Lucy Riall, *The Italian Risorgimento. State, Society & National Unification*, (Routledge, London/New York: 1994); John Dickie, 'The Notion of Italy', in: *Modern Italian Culture*, edited by Zygmunt G. Barański, Rebecca J. West, (Cambridge University Press, New York: 2001); Brian Richardson, 'Questions of Language', in: *Modern Italian Culture*; Anna Cento Bull, 'Social and Political Cultures from 1860 to the Present', in: *Modern Italian Culture*; William Halperin, Italian Anticlericalism, 1871-1914, *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 19/1, (March 1947). A short overview of Italian freemasons is given by Anna Maria Isastia, 'La Franc-Maçonnerie et la construction du citoyen en Italie', *Journal for Research into Freemasonry and Fraternalism*, vol. 1/1, (Equinox: 2010), p. 36-48.

not accused of interfering in politics and undermining the regime; an allegation not completely unwarranted.²

The Grand Lodge of Scotland

The *Grand Lodge of Ancient, Free and Accepted Masons of Scotland* was founded in Edinburgh in 1736. With the establishment of the Grand Lodge, as Lisa Kahler notes, for the first time ‘a union of Scottish lodges was created’ and masonry was increasingly perceived as a ‘nation-wide masonic community’.³

Since so many lodges pre-dated the Grand Lodge, they managed to preserve their sovereignty and a considerable degree of control over their own affairs.⁴ Unlike English lodges, which were much more strictly supervised and centralised, Scottish lodges perpetuated their own traditions. This relative degree of autonomy regarding the elaboration of rituals and practices may well account for foreign lodges preferring to be legitimated by the Grand Lodge of Scotland, rather than by the London based Grand Lodge of England.

The Grand Orient of France

The *Grand Orient de France* was established in 1773 and is the second oldest of its kind in Europe. Lodges belonging to the Grand Orient started to call themselves liberal lodges after a decision was made to abandon the notion of the Grand Architect at a meeting in 1877. This decree was agreed upon in order to emphasise the notion of freedom of conscience and religion. As a result other grand lodges, including the

² Karim Wissa, ‘Freemasonry in Egypt 1798 – 1921: A Study in Cultural and Political Encounters’, *British Society for Middle Eastern Studies*, vol.16/2, (1989); Albert Kudsi-Zadeh, ‘Afghani and Freemasonry in Egypt’, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 92/1, (Jan. - Mar. 1972); Elie Kedourie, *Young Turks, Freemasons and Jews*, *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 7/1, (Jan. 1971).

³ Lisa Kahler, ‘The Grand Lodge of Scotland and the Establishment of the masonic Community’, www.srmason-sj.org/web/heredom-files/volume7/grand-lodge-of-scotland.htm, (13.03.2007).

⁴ Interview with Robert Cooper, curator of the Grand Lodge of Scotland, (Winter 2008).

Grand Lodge of England, broke all ties with the Grand Orient. Additionally, the recognition of mixed gender lodges by the Grand Orient was not favourably received by many grand lodges.

Before the French Revolution, as Margaret Jacob notes, masonic lodges ‘mirrored the social tensions and antagonisms of the old regime, while at the same time offering the alternative inherent in the new political culture of the Enlightenment’.⁵ Meetings served as a forum for the whole spectrum of socio-political ideas. The lodges worked towards a new political culture, in which they sought to define civil society as an arena for individuals to focus on shared interests, purposes and values. While some masons participated in revolutionary acts, the majority used their position inside the lodge to define their own civic identity.

French society during the revolutionary period was characterised by wide schisms between the different social strata. As Jacob notes, ‘the lodges had come to mirror the breakdown of social relations’.⁶ But, while initially trying to cope with the conflicting classes and to bridge the gaps between them, most lodges instead inadvertently widened the discrepancies, as Jacob again notes, ‘between the elite and the popular and also between the military and the civilian’. The French lodges insisted on a suitable social composition that was only comprised of honourable men. Thus, lodges were shaped by a distinctive social hierarchy.⁷

During the Enlightenment in France, clear differences between the upper strata of society were confused. The literary and cultural intelligentsia was seen as equal to aristocratic noblemen. French freemasons spoke out for scientific education and gender equality, but retained the social distance to the society’s lower strata. As Janet Burke and Margaret Jacob note, ‘by the 1760s both concepts, liberty and equality,

⁵ Jacob, *Enlightenment*: p. 179.

⁶ *Ibid.*: p. 184.

⁷ *Ibid.*: p. 186.

appeared on the intellectual agenda of enlightened and reforming circles'. However, these topics were only discussed by the literate and financially comfortable. At the same time, charitable and benevolent acts were used to enhance the public prestige of masons and to confront their government.

According to Philip Nord, French masonry 'experienced an explosion of recruitment under the Empire'. The number of lodges rose from 244 in 1857 to 392 in 1870. In the 1850s, freemasonry became more radical, partly as a consequence of state oppression; partly reasoned by the function of lodges as refuges for all sorts of radicals.⁸ With the election of Prince Lucien Murat, a member of the Bonaparte family, as grand master, French masons tried to receive protection from the top. However, Murat closed down 100 lodges on the basis of the new Imperial constitution.⁹ Over time his autocratic and quasi-royal approach fermented considerable opposition.¹⁰ A new social class came to power, visible some time later in the election of the new grand master, the journalist Leonidé Babaud-Larivière. Elite lodge representatives were no longer present and the changed *zeitgeist* required reforms of the old status quo. One of the principles that the new generation of masons changed was the oath in the old constitution regarding the existence of the Grand Architect. Now such an oath was considered to be an obstacle against freedom of conscience. As Nord remarks, 'the Grand Orient's embrace of secularism marked a turning point not only in its internal history but also in its relations with masonic movements abroad,' since most of the grand lodges suspended contact with the French.¹¹

⁸ Philip Nord, 'Republicanism and Utopian Vision: French Freemasonry in the 1860s and 1870s', *Journal of Modern History*, vol. 63, (June 1991), p. 213-214.

⁹ *Ibid.*: p. 215.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*: p. 216-217.

¹¹ *Ibid.*: p. 219.

Masons of the Grand Orient were thus anti-clerical and espoused rationalist ethics in the cause of a ‘visionary humanitarianism’ and universal brotherhood.¹² They demanded more rights for women and education for everyone. However, equal education was not understood as complete liberation for women, but rather as an adequate tool to provide future generations with fitting intellectual homes in which to be raised. In this sense, freemasons acted as a civil vanguard, with their pacifist agenda, calls for class reconciliation and anti-racist rhetoric.¹³ While society certainly did not experience a masonic-induced revolution, their ideologies were transferred to other movements and organisations. This resulted in the gradual change of French civil and political life, which nourished the myth of the masonic battle cry for *liberté, égalité et fraternité*.

Masonic Grand Bodies in the Ottoman Empire

As this thesis focuses on Ottoman Syria, only masonic grand bodies related to freemasonry relevant for the concerned area can be taken into account. The first lodges established in the Ottoman Empire worked under the patronage of European masonic bodies. Originally freemasonry was introduced into the Empire during the eighteenth century.¹⁴ The Grand Lodge of Scotland established one of the first lodges in Aleppo and Smyrna, with Alexander Drummond, British Consul in Aleppo, being named Provincial Grand Master of *Pour l’Orient* Grand Lodge. Provincial or district grand masters were provided with full power ‘to constitute lodges in any part of Europe or Asia bordering on the Mediterranean Sea, and superintend the same, or any

¹² Ibid.: p. 221.

¹³ Ibid.: p. 226-228.

¹⁴ Albert G. Mackey, H.L. Haywood, *Encyclopaedia of Freemasonry*, vol.I, (Kessinger Publishing, Whitefish/Mt: 2003), p. 316.

others already erected in those parts of the world'.¹⁵ Additional lodges in Constantinople allegedly worked under the Grand Orient of Geneva, the Grand Lodge of Poland and others.¹⁶

But it was only one hundred years later that freemasonry indeed started to expand, though even then Constantinople and Cairo remained the main focus.¹⁷ In his articles, Paul Dumont referred to the proclamation of the 1839 Reform Edict, which guaranteed more rights to Ottomans and foreigners alike when establishing philanthropic societies 'without fear of legal proceedings and punishment'. According to Dumont, the increasing number of lodges came as a result of a new trend towards European influences: 'receptiveness to economic penetration and political influence, receptiveness to ideas prevailing in Europe, and also receptiveness to individuals coming from the West'.¹⁸ When so-called irregular freemasonry – lodges not recognised and controlled by Western masonic bodies - seemed to get out of hand, it was Sir Henry Bulwer, ambassador in Constantinople from 1858, who became the first District Grand Master for Turkey in 1862. At this time the lodge *Pour l'Orient* was working under the Grand Lodge of England.¹⁹

Naturally Constantinople, the Ottoman capital and centre of political and economic power, was attractive for freemasons as it had 'close links with Europe not only in the commercial domain but also on the cultural level'.²⁰ Freemasonry spread in a certain pattern, whereas lodges were built in important commercial centres like

¹⁵ Harland-Jacobs, *Builders of Empire*, p. 38.

¹⁶ Daniel Ligou, *Dictionnaire de la franc-maçonnerie*, (Presses Universitaires de France, Paris : 1987), pp. 1223.

¹⁷ Cecil Layikteç, 'The History of Freemasonry in Turkey', www.themasonictrowel.com/Articles/History/other_files/the_hystory_of_freemasonry_in_turkey.htm, (17.11.2010).

¹⁸ Paul Dumont, 'Freemasonry in Turkey: a by-product of Western penetration', <http://turcologie.u-strasbg.fr/dets/images/travaux/freemasonry%20in%20turkey.pdf>, (17.11.2010), p. 1 - 2.

¹⁹ Ligou, p. 1223 – 1224.

²⁰ Dumont, p. 3.

Smyrna or Alexandria and Cairo in Egypt, centres of Western occupation like Cyprus or places marked by political instability, such as Salonica.²¹

The character of the lodges depended on their ethnic and social structures, and more often than not displayed imperialist or nationalist attitudes. However, Dumont also clarifies that masonic meetings also revolved around other subjects. Some masons simply enjoyed ‘lavish banquets, with a lot of drinking, convened in the trail of masonic ceremonies’ while others ‘preferred to devote their sittings to activities of spiritual character, and more specifically to ceremonies of initiation’. Again others used masonic links for philanthropy and the exchange of ideas.

In cases where lodges took on a certain political position, they were either inclined to support French or the British interests, depending on the affiliation of their grand bodies, or they promoted the national goals of their own community. This was the case with some of the purely Armenian or Greek lodges founded in Constantinople.²² While the Armenians strove for more autonomy, some Greek lodges worked towards ‘the establishment of a new Byzantine state’, which was supposed ‘to unite Turks and Greeks under the shadow of an enlightened Ottoman Sultan’.²³

Unlike Dumont, who claims that it was only after the Young Turk Revolution in 1908 that ‘Ottoman freemasons started to feel self-confident enough to display publicly their political opinions’²⁴, Hanioglu convincingly shows the connections between early national activists and the beginnings of the Young Turk movement. According to him, the various nationalist groups – some masonic lodges included – displayed strong support for the Young Turks before the actual revolution took place.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.: p. 6 – 8. For early lodges affiliated with the Grand Lodge of England: *Lane’s Masonic Records, 1717 – 1894*, online: www.freemasonry.dept.shef.ac.uk/lane/, (23.11.2010).

²³ M. Şükrü Hanioglu, ‘Notes on the Young Turks and the Freemasons, 1875 – 1908’, *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 25/2, (April 1989), p. 186 – 187.

²⁴ Dumont: p. 10.

Not only did they publish articles in which they justified any attempts to antagonise Abdulhamid II, they also supplied ‘Young Turks with safe houses where they could take cover from government agents’.²⁵ At the end of the day, however, with the overthrow of regime, this symbiosis between the numerous groups came to an end. It was commonly understood that an ‘alliance with the Young Turks had been based on mutual interest’, but that now, with the beginning of a new era and a big part of the population ‘fired by the emergence of Turkish nationalism’, the movements’ future goals diverged or were even mutually exclusive.²⁶

As has been observed in relation to European lodges and their evolution during the nineteenth century, attempts to nationalise freemasonry took place everywhere, with the Ottoman Empire being no exception. When in power, the Young Turks were keen to have their own lodges under their own obedience, which would oppose the foreign influence that they perceived as ‘masonic colonization’. This endeavour naturally triggered alarm among the Western masonic bodies, which consequently decided not to accept and recognise the Ottoman Grand Orient as a regular masonic body.²⁷ The Grand Lodge of England, for example, kept a low profile during this period, when British foreign policy had to deal with a moral dilemma and was more indecisive than ever before. Its non-recognition of two grand lodges – the Grand Lodge of Egypt, founded in 1908, and the Ottoman Grand Orient, established in 1909 – while having created the Provincial Grand Lodge of Turkey (1862) and having recognised some forty years earlier the Grand National Lodge of Egypt (1870) is proof of its cautious attitude.²⁸ The British government considered the reforms

²⁵ Hanioglu: p. 193.

²⁶ Ibid.: p. 194.

²⁷ Ibid.: p. 11 – 12.

²⁸ The Provincial Grand Lodge became extinct already in 1884 ; also: Eric Anduze, *La Franc-Maçonnerie au Moyen-Orient et au Maghreb fin XIXe – début XXe siècle*, (L’Harmattan, Paris: 2005), p. 17 – 18.

carried out by the Young Turks to be promising. However, by no means did it want to encourage its subjects in neighbouring Egypt to follow the same path, thereby, claiming their rights for a constitution and self-determination. Hence, by ignoring the two new grand bodies for the time being, it tried to avoid any indirect encouragement for separatist and nationalist movements.

With the end of World War One, the Ottoman ventures in freemasonry, which had only been successful in the areas in and around Constantinople, cease, along with the task to establish *one* national freemasonry for the Empire as a single entity.

In Egypt many of the lodges, though created by Europeans, 'included Egyptian intellectuals, professionals and notables'. Among this group was Prince Halim Pasha, Muhammad Ali's youngest son. Apparently he became grand master and a leading figure of freemasonry until exiled in 1868.²⁹ 'Generally speaking, Freemasonry in Egypt worked toward the promotion of brotherhood, philanthropy and charitable institutions, although sometimes it was used for undesirable purposes'. What is here meant are political interferences, such as the unsuccessful attempts of Prince Halim Pasha and his followers to agitate against the rule of Ismail, the khedive of Egypt, using masonic connections in Egypt and in exile. Prince Halim Pasha who was the youngest son of Muhammad Ali felt betrayed when left without any powerful position.³⁰ Lodges seemed suited for these kinds of activity thanks to their secrecy and the steady initiations of the 'educated and public-spirited classes'.³¹

'On May 8, 1876, a reorganisation resulted in three separate Grand Masonic Bodies, the National Grand Lodge of Egypt, the Supreme Council of the Scottish Rite,

²⁹ Cecil Layikteç, 'The History of Freemasonry in Turkey', www.themasonictrowel.com/Articles/History/other_files/the_hystory_of_freemasonry_in_turkey.htm, (17.11.2010).

³⁰ Albert Kudsi-Zadeh, 'Afghani and Freemasonry in Egypt', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 92/1, (Jan. - Mar. 1972), p. 26.

³¹ *Ibid.*: p. 28.

and the Sovereign Grand Council of the Memphis Rite with the National Grand Lodge in 1879 being proclaimed as “free, sovereign and independent” of any other body’.³²

In the same year, Al-Afghani gave an interview to the London *Times*, calling for an ‘Egypt for the Egyptians’.³³ While it may be true that Al-Afghani had no notable influence on Egyptian nationalists, as he had already been for three years, ‘he left behind an elite of intellectuals and revolutionaries whose activities matured and strengthened in the ensuing years until they culminated in the ‘Urabi revolt of 1881 – 82’.³⁴ And again, freemasonry proved to be a convenient vehicle to transport and spread nationalist ideas while ignoring contradictory interests at least for the time being. Though, even less successful than Constantinople, Egypt under British occupation never freed itself from Western masonic obedience. In 1899 the District Grand Lodge of Egypt-Sudan was founded, with Lord Kitchener as grand master. This date corresponds with the start of Anglo-Egyptian protectorate over the Sudan.³⁵

Most of the lodges, district grand lodges and supreme councils in Ottoman Turkey and Egypt fit perfectly into the system described by Jessica Harland-Jacobs. Thus, with the gradual disintegration of the Ottoman Empire and the advance of single proto-state entities under Western hegemony, European freemasonry also expanded in the region. In doing so the fraternity conformed to newly occupied areas and their redefined borders. However, it is significant that freemasonry was also adaptable in terms of innate nationalist causes outside Western reach. This was the case when cooperating with the Young Turks: ‘Young Turks used freemasonry to circumvent freemasonry, at least this specific type of freemasonry which expressed,

³² *Encyclopaedia*: p. 316.

³³ Kudsî-Zadeh: p. 32.

³⁴ *Ibid.*: p. 34.

³⁵ Robert Gould, *Gould’s History of Freemasonry throughout the World, vol.4*, (Charles Scribner’s sons, New York: 1936), p. 233.

within the Ottoman Empire, the certitudes of the conquering West'.³⁶ This understanding of freemasonry as a tool for their own purposes will be further analysed in the following chapters, when dealing with lodges founded in Ottoman Syria. Any nationalist purposes of early Syrian lodges were far less pronounced and not yet politicised, but what they had in common with the freemasons in Constantinople and Egypt was a shared attitude towards the institution of freemasonry itself: it may have arrived as a colonial souvenir from the West, but Syrians soon managed to form it into something of their own.

Backed by French and Scottish masonic institutions, freemasonry in Ottoman Syria nevertheless developed in its own realm. From the point of view of the Western powers, the Ottoman Empire counted as one entity with grand masonic bodies to be placed in Constantinople or in Egypt, which was governed independently and, after 1882, functioned as a British protectorate. Contrarily, lodges in Syria willingly used to choose different affiliations, which will be further analysed in the following chapters. Lodges affiliated with the Scottish, French or Italian masonic bodies – unlike the early lodges described in Constantinople – did not express strong pro-Western views. Rather, they proclaimed a commitment to peaceful cooperation among the inhabitants of Syria in order to secure their own individual interests.³⁷ Only the Young Turk Revolution changed this apparent lack of national interest, with the foundation of two lodges under the obedience of the Ottoman Grand Orient and the Grand National Lodge of Egypt (Appendix II).

Before that, only loose links to Egyptian lodges or other lodges outside Syria were established by migrating freemasons. Many of these masons joined the *Star in the East* Lodge in Cairo, which worked under the patronage of the United Grand

³⁶ Dumont: p. 14.

³⁷ Similarly, Jacob Landau was not able to uncover additional connections: Jacob Landau, *Middle Eastern Themes: Papers in History and Politics*, (Routledge, London: 1973), p. 45.

Lodge of England and was established as a result of a petition signed by Mohammed Abduh. Abduh himself had been a member of *La Concordia* Lodge.³⁸ A thorough examination of the list of members of the various lodges indicates that lodge-hopping was not confined to Syrian masons.³⁹ The English lodges in Egypt and Constantinople were mainly composed of Europeans who undertook lodge-hopping.⁴⁰ In general, the Syrians in Egypt were less prone to join foreign societies, whether they were political or social. A study of secret societies in Egypt in 1911 shows that almost no Syrians were involved in any of these endeavours.⁴¹ Lists of names, nevertheless, have to be treated carefully as they were compiled by the British Secret Service Bureau in June 1911 without further re-examination.

Other Syrian freemasons went to Palestine, which was still considered as part of the Syrian Lands, but which nevertheless was unaffected by the masonic network span in the area during the years before the Young Turk Revolution. One of the masons was Alexander Howard, whose original name was Iskandar Awad and who had joined *Le Liban Lodge* in 1871.⁴² He moved from Beirut to Jaffa, serving as the local representative of the British travel agent Thomas Cook. He ran the first bus between Jaffa and Jerusalem and owned several hotels and houses in the latter city.⁴³ His splendid house in Jaffa was adorned with a marble frieze over the entrance, with

³⁸ Registration Books of the UGLoE, 1868, *La Concordia*.

³⁹ Member lists of English lodges in Constantinople, Cairo and Alexandria suggest that they were frequented by a large number of non-Arabs, who probably changed lodges according to their travel route or work location. Lists indicate lodges in Constantinople (*Oriental Lodge* in 1856, *Deutscher Bund Lodge* in 1860, *Bulwer Lodge* in 1861, *Areta Lodge* in 1864); in Cairo (*St. John's Lodge* in 1862, *Bulwer Lodge* in 1865, *Grecia Lodge* in 1866, *La Concordia Lodge* in 1868, *Star in the East Lodge* in 1871); and in Alexandria (*Hyde Clarke Lodge* in 1865, *Zetland Lodge* in 1867, *St. John and St. Paul Lodge* in the 1870s), *D.S.*

⁴⁰ Most striking were the two Englishmen Hyde Clarke and Henry Bulwer, who not only joined various lodges but who also had lodges named after them, *D.S.*

⁴¹ Eliezer Tauber, 'Egyptian Secret Societies, 1911', *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 42/4, (July 2006), p. 610 – 618.

⁴² Correspondence between *Le Liban* and the GODF, carton no 1, Archive of the GODF.

⁴³ Leon Zeldis, a scholar deeply involved in research into the history of Israeli lodges, is currently working on a publication about the Barkai Lodge, founded in Jaffa in 1906 under the Grand Orient de France.

an inscription that read *Shalom al Israel* (*Peace over Israel*, see Figure 5), which is still extant and has, according to Leon Zeldis, functioned as a masonic hall.⁴⁴ Howard later on joined *Barkai* Lodge in Jaffa.



Figure 5: Photograph of the Entrance to Alexander Howard's House in Jaffa (photographed in 2008, D.S.).

Already in 1868 the travelling American freemason Robert Morris had named 'J. G. Eldridge now Deputy Grand master for the District Syria', when he visited Beirut. Whilst the post was already occupied, Morris supported the idea of a provincial grand lodge established in Jaffa under the supervision of the Grand Orient

⁴⁴ According to Zeldis, the building later served as meeting place for Jewish immigrants at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. Afterwards it became the headquarters of the central committee of a pioneer Zionist movement of Russian Jews. Zeldis researched the history of freemasonry in Israel in general: Leon Zeldis, *Bnei-Or Be-Eretz Hakodesh* (Sons of Light in the Holy Land), (E.Narkis Publishing House, Herzlia: 2009).

of France; a proposal which was declined as, according to Morris, the petitioners except for 'Excellency Nouredin Effendi' were not French masons.⁴⁵

According to other sources, it was only in 1921 that the Grand Lodge of Scotland considered the establishment of a District Grand Lodge for Syria, which may have arisen as a consequence to British and French control of the area before France was assigned the mandate in 1923. However, no further steps in this direction were taken.⁴⁶ It was as late as 1955 - 1956 that the Grand Lodge of New York finally established a District Grand Lodge for Syria and Lebanon, without consent from the Grand Lodge of Scotland.⁴⁷ By this time, however, other national masonic grand bodies had already been founded and in Lebanon alone there were at least three different allegiances at work: the Grand Orient of Lebanon, the Grand Lodge of Lebanon and the Syrian-Lebanese Grand Lodge.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Robert Morris, *Freemasonry in the Holy Land*, (Masonic Pub. C., New York: 1872), p.219, 259.

⁴⁶ Supreme Council USA, *The New Age*, vol. 29, (1921), p. 479.

⁴⁷ <http://lebanonmasonry.info/>, (19.11.2010).

⁴⁸ Ligou: p. 708. Ligou also mentions a Grand Lodge named *Hounayn Kattini* though it is not impossible that this is a confusion with a mason's name; a member of the Grand Lodge of Lebanon called Hounayn Kattini served as a masonic authority for the Memphis Rite in Arab countries; <http://grandorientarabe.blogspot.com/2010/03/lu-sur-le-blog-maconnique-de-jiri.html>; www.grandorientarabe.org/index.php?p=1_8_Liban-Syrie-Palestine, (03.01.2011), D.S..